

1 November 1976

Memorandum for: John F. Blake,
Deputy Director for Administration

From : [REDACTED]
ADMAG Member

Subject : A different perspective on the questions of
the measurement and elevation of morale and
the improved status of personnel.

Resulting from our recent ADMAG meeting and your memorandum of 28 October 1976, let me offer these thoughts for your consideration:

That there is a concern for the morale and perceived status of people is, I believe, an indication of greater maturity and sophistication, not only on the part of management but society itself.

However, to target for goals that measure and elevate morale and status is to hit below the mark. We get embroiled in a quagmire of questions; for what purpose are the measurements wanted? In what manner is the measurement to be made; organizationally, ethnically, racially, sexually, professionally, etc.? To what is the measurement to be compared? For that matter, does morale need to be increased and by how much? Does any particular group or element need greater emphasis than another? Once achieved, how will morale be maintained?

It also follows that with major changes in policy or procedure or leadership it might be necessary to begin the process all over again; an unending cycle.

Morale and status are not really tangible things. We say that the esprit de corps of the Marine's is very high; so was that of the Japanese Kamakaze's. The status of a corporate president is very high; so is that of a Mafia Godfather in his organization.

Morale and status are by-products of our total environment and how we react to and are seen by ourselves and others in that environment. The highest state of morale is reached by those who truly believe in what they are doing. The deeper

the belief, the stronger the commitment. Commitment nurtures enthusiasm, energy, and will. This kind of activity promotes achievement, energy and success; hence, status.

More importantly, an organization and the people within it who believe in their occupational endeavor plan toward a kind of continual becoming rather than a final goal. Like most large organizations, it has been unavoidable that much of our direction was unplanned. We have generally survived through a flexibility of response, rather than through the formulation of enduring plans.

Watergate and all the ensuing investigations has taught us that an organization and its people must continually change if the organization is to survive over time. Prior to this the concept of change was impeded by misoneism. If we admitted that improvements were possible, then we were also admitting we had lived so long with inefficiency.

Acceptance of new concepts can change the responsibility held by some individuals. Thus, improvement can become tied to interdepartmental politics. Senior management must oversee these changes to insure that the results reflect the best interests of the whole organization.

Through Management By Objectives we have acquired a tool to help us identify problems, their causes, and solutions. We have applied MBO to missions, operations, personnel management, APP, PDP, EEO, and almost all facets of our activity.


In stating our objectives we learn to specify only the "what" and "when", to avoid the "why" and "how". That is as it should be, provided we have written our philosophy prior to stating our objectives and goals; ie, what do we believe and what is the basis for that belief. Once a mutually agreeable philosophy is reached we then have a plan against which to weigh our goals and objectives; "why" have we set this goal and "how" will it contribute to the fulfillment of our ideals.

We must persuade people first to commit themselves to a common plan. To accomplish this we have to create a voluntary interaction at all levels. Once given the intent, action will follow and the natural by-products high morale and status will be derived.

Those who participate in designing these new concepts must have an awareness of real needs and conditions, knowledge of organizational structure and management, and freedom of thought. The best results occur when all personnel participate in a free spirit that finds their occupational endeavors also congruent with their personal, familial, social and indeed their spirit-

ual philosophy.

With well defined ideals it will be less difficult to understand and achieve the objectives we have chosen and directed objectives such as those of enviornmental control, community relations, and equal opportunities. .



STATINTL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/01/08 : CIA-RDP80-00473A000300070012-3

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

EXTENSION

NO.

STATINTL

DATE

12 November 1976

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. *EO* Deputy Director for Administration

1/18/77

[Signature]

ADMAG has discussed this paper and agrees that the primary issue regarding questions a,d, and e of your 28/10/76 memorandum is the need for executive management to establish performance (ethical) standards against which all policies, procedures, goals, and objectives can be weighed.

2. *DDDA*

3. *DDA*

17 NOV 1976

[Signature]

The Group will continue to study the application of this issue.

5. *Mike Malachuk*

17 NOV 1976

[Signature]

If desired, I will prepare a further discussion of the theory which lead to this opinion.

7. *[Redacted]*

18 JAN 1977

[Signature]

[Signature]
WTG

STATINTL

A blamin' philosopher in CMS (though I suspect *[Redacted]* had a heavier hand in this)

ILLEGIB

[Handwritten signature]

[Large black redaction box]

☐ SECRET

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

DDA Registry
File 04M 2-2

28 October 1976

DDA Registry Background

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, ADMAG

FROM : John F. Blake
Deputy Director for Administration

Bill:

1. I first state that we had what I considered to be a most productive meeting on Tuesday, 26 October 1976. As was mentioned at that meeting, we had a similar session about a year ago in an endeavor to try to accomplish the same thing we did on Tuesday. For reasons which are not completely clear, we were not successful at that time, although I do believe the environment that then existed with our external investigations was not particularly helpful. In any event I think we have now mutually agreed on a proper and constructive course of action and, speaking for myself, I should like to see us work together to pursue it vigorously.

2. There is attached for the study of you and your colleagues a memorandum of 22 October 1976 addressed to all DDA Office Heads which addresses itself to Management by Objectives (MBO) for FY 1977. In only one case is a DCI objective stated as such. The reason for this I partially hit upon at our meeting. While this Directorate submitted to the Office of the Comptroller objectives categorized as DCI, DDA and Office level, the Comptroller did not accept them as such. I believe this will be straightened out at a later date but, in any event, all the listed objectives remain valid. Should you desire any background material or discussion on the MBO's, please feel free to consult with [REDACTED] Chief, Management and Assessment Staff, DDA on extension [REDACTED]. We would be pleased to receive any reaction ADMAG may choose to give on this matter.

STATINTL

STATINTL

E2 IMPDET
CL BY 001777

3. I would offer for consideration for study by your group the following topics. You are free to pick and choose as you will, but I would appreciate your prioritizing them and also making any comments you see fit on both their relevancy and significance. I am deliberately listing them in a random order which does not reflect my own sense of priorities:

a. Within the Directorate of Administration what factors are best identified to measure morale?

b. Does a system of internal communications, from top to bottom, exist in each Directorate Office so that all members are kept abreast of all matters of general Agency, Directorate and Office interest?

c. From the perception of employees are Letters of Instruction (LOI) accomplishing a useful purpose? Should any part of the procedure be changed? Should the system of LOI's be discontinued?

d. What recommendations, reasonable to accomplish, would ADMAG make to increase Directorate morale?

e. What are ADMAG's comments on the following Agency-level objective as made to the Office of Management and Budget: "Improve the perceived status of personnel in service versus production or collection elements"?

STATINTL



John F. Blake

Att

Distribution:

Orig - Chairman, ADMAG w/att

~~1~~ - DDA Subject w/att (DDA 76-5205 - Memo to DDA Office Directors
fr ADDA dtd 22 October 1976; MBO-FY-77

1 - DDA Chrono w/o att

1 - DDA ADMAG File/

1 - JFB Chrono w/o att

DDA:JFBBlake:der (28 October 1976)

STATINTL